

November 17, 2020

1

Page 1

1 - STUART VARDAMAN -

2 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3 FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

4 ----- X
5 ULKU ROWE,

6 Plaintiff,

7 Case No.
8 19 Civ. 08655 (LGS) (GWG)

9 v.

10 GOOGLE LLC

11 Defendant.

12 ----- X

13 DATE: November 17, 2020

14 TIME: 9:37 a.m.

15 VIDEOTAPED VIDEOCONFERENCE DEPOSITION

16 OF STUART VARDAMAN, held via Zoom, pursuant to ^

17 Notice, before Hope Menaker, a Shorthand Reporter

18 and Notary Public of the State of New York.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 134</p> <p>1 - STUART VARDAMAN -</p> <p>2 MS. GREENE: It -- it should be in</p> <p>3 there. It's right under -- in mine at least</p> <p>4 under Exhibit 114.</p> <p>5 MR. GAGE: Yeah, I see it.</p> <p>6 (Whereupon, Exhibit 115 was marked at</p> <p>7 this time.)</p> <p>8 Q. Do you recognize this document?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. And what do you recognize this</p> <p>11 document to be?</p> <p>12 A. I recognize it to be the draft</p> <p>13 version of the role in Kirsten's organization, the</p> <p>14 VP role --</p> <p>15 Q. And --</p> <p>16 A. -- the VP role.</p> <p>17 Q. And is this the -- is this what you</p> <p>18 provided to Ms. Rowe?</p> <p>19 A. I guess so.</p> <p>20 Q. In the prior exhibit, 114, you wrote,</p> <p>21 "It sounds like she and Rob are open to 'thinking</p> <p>22 differently' about this role, so it is not</p> <p>23 necessarily a prerequisite that someone has</p> <p>24 carried a sales revenue number." What did you</p> <p>25 mean about Kirsten and Rob thinking differently</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 136</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page not submitted in support of Google's motion for summary judgment</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 135</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page not submitted in support of Google's motion for summary judgment</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 137</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page not submitted in support of Google's motion for summary judgment</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 138</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page not submitted in support of Google's motion for summary judgment</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 140</p> <p>1 - STUART VARDAMAN -</p> <p>2 A. That was the thrust of the</p> <p>3 conversation and tying back to the appropriate</p> <p>4 next steps on the search, an appropriate next step</p> <p>5 in this case was winding down the process for Ulku</p> <p>6 and keeping her in mind for future executive</p> <p>7 positions within the financial services</p> <p>8 organization.</p> <p>9 Q. What was the basis for your</p> <p>10 determination that she was not qualified for a</p> <p>11 position that was at the VP level?</p> <p>12 A. It --</p> <p>13 MR. GAGE: Objection.</p> <p>14 A. It was largely emphasized by who</p> <p>15 ultimately the -- the candidates that we had in</p> <p>16 play and ultimately who landed in the role which</p> <p>17 is Yolanda Piazza, which as a -- as a data point</p> <p>18 was listed as one of American Bankers' most</p> <p>19 powerful women in -- in 2019, I believe.</p> <p>20 Q. At this moment when you communicated</p> <p>21 this to Ms. Rowe, what was your basis for</p> <p>22 determining that she was not qualified to be</p> <p>23 considered for a VP level role?</p> <p>24 MR. GAGE: Objection.</p> <p>25 A. That would have been largely driven</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 139</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page not submitted in support of Google's motion for summary judgment</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 141</p> <p>1 - STUART VARDAMAN -</p> <p>2 by her comparison to the external candidates.</p> <p>3 Q. As of February, 2020 who were the</p> <p>4 external candidates that were being considered?</p> <p>5 A. I don't know. I'd have to look that</p> <p>6 up. Yolanda Piazza was likely involved by then.</p> <p>7 Q. Had interviews taken place at that</p> <p>8 point in time, panel interviews?</p> <p>9 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>10 Q. Did you consider the feedback with</p> <p>11 respect to Ms. Rowe in terms of determining that</p> <p>12 she was not qualified to be considered for this VP</p> <p>13 role?</p> <p>14 MR. GAGE: Objection.</p> <p>15 A. No, I didn't. Again, with the --</p> <p>16 with the financial services vertical lead role</p> <p>17 that ultimately was canceled, right, Tariq asked</p> <p>18 us to include her in process.</p> <p>19 Q. Did you consider your close-out notes</p> <p>20 in Thrive with respect to Ms. Rowe in determining</p> <p>21 that she was not qualified to be considered for</p> <p>22 the VP sales role?</p> <p>23 MR. GAGE: Objection.</p> <p>24 A. No. As I stated, I don't recall</p> <p>25 entering that -- that close-out note and I think</p>

Page 142

Page not submitted in support of
Google's motion for summary judgment

Page 144

Page not submitted in support of
Google's motion for summary judgment

Page 143

1 - STUART VARDAMAN -
2 network was?
3 A. I don't recall.
4 Q. Do you know whether Ms. Rowe was
5 considered or had an external reputation as an
6 expert in this area?
7 MR. GAGE: Objection.
8 A. No, I don't recall.
9 Q. Do you know whether Ms. Rowe had a
10 reputation as an industry titan, as you referred
11 to it?
12 A. Compared to someone like Yolanda Pi
13 -- Yolanda Piazza, I would say there's wide space.
14 Q. Did you know what Ms. Rowe's
15 reputation was externally with respect to her job?
16 MR. GAGE: Objection.
17 A. No.
18 Q. Did you do anything to ascertain what
19 her external reputation was professionally?
20 A. No, not that I recall.
21 MR. GAGE: Objection.
22 Q. Did you have any basis to compare Ms.
23 Rowe to Ms. Piazza?
24 A. Aside from the publication as an
25 example, I don't recall.

Page 145

Page not submitted in support of
Google's motion for summary judgment